

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JARED ANDREW MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

RAYTHEL FISHER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00847-JLT-EPG (PC)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS,  
RECOMMENDING THAT THIS CASE BE  
DISMISSED, WITHOUT PREJUDICE,  
BECAUSE OF PLAINTIFF’S FAILURE  
PROSECUTE THIS CASE

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE WITHIN  
FOURTEEN DAYS

Jared Martin (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner (or former prisoner) proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On January 26, 2023, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion to expedite Court proceedings. (ECF No. 11). The order was returned as undeliverable.

Pursuant to Local Rule 183(b), “[a] party appearing in propria persona shall keep the Court and opposing parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a plaintiff in propria persona by the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, and if such plaintiff fails to notify the Court and opposing parties within sixty-three (63) days thereafter of a current address, the Court may dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute.” Additionally, in the First Informational Order in Prisoner/Civil Detainee Civil Rights Case the Court informed Plaintiff that, “[i]f mail directed to a pro se plaintiff at the address of record is returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable, the order will not be re-served a

1 second time absent a notice of change of address. If a pro se plaintiff's address is not updated  
2 within sixty-three (63) days of mail being returned as undeliverable, the case will be dismissed  
3 for failure to prosecute." (ECF No. 2, p. 5).

4 Plaintiff's deadline to update his address has passed, and Plaintiff has not filed a notice  
5 of change of address. Accordingly, Plaintiff failed to keep the Court informed of his current  
6 address as required by this Court's local rules and the First Informational Order in  
7 Prisoner/Civil Detainee Civil Rights Case. Therefore, the Court will recommend that this case  
8 be dismissed, without prejudice, because of Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this case.

9 "In determining whether to dismiss a[n] [action] for failure to prosecute or failure to  
10 comply with a court order, the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest  
11 in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of  
12 prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the  
13 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits." Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d  
14 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

15 "The public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal."  
16 Id. (quoting Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)). Accordingly,  
17 this factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

18 As to the Court's need to manage its docket, "[t]he trial judge is in the best position to  
19 determine whether the delay in a particular case interferes with docket management and the  
20 public interest.... It is incumbent upon the Court to manage its docket without being subject to  
21 routine noncompliance of litigants...." Id. Plaintiff has failed to keep the Court informed of his  
22 current address. This failure is delaying this case and interfering with docket management.  
23 Therefore, the second factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

24 Turning to the risk of prejudice, "pendency of a lawsuit is not sufficiently prejudicial in  
25 and of itself to warrant dismissal." Id. (citing Yourish, 191 F.3d at 991). However, "delay  
26 inherently increases the risk that witnesses' memories will fade and evidence will become  
27 stale," id. at 643, and it is Plaintiff's failure to keep the Court informed of his current address  
28 that is causing delay and preventing this case from progressing. The Court is unable to contact

1 Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's failure to update his address, and the case cannot proceed  
2 without Plaintiff. Therefore, the third factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

3 As for the availability of lesser sanctions, given that Plaintiff has stopped prosecuting  
4 this case, despite being warned of possible dismissal, there is little available to the Court which  
5 would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further  
6 unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Considering Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis*  
7 status, it appears that monetary sanctions are of little use. And as Plaintiff has stopped  
8 prosecuting this case, excluding evidence would be a meaningless sanction. Additionally,  
9 because the dismissal being considered in this case is without prejudice, the Court is stopping  
10 short of using the harshest possible sanction of dismissal with prejudice.

11 Finally, because public policy favors disposition on the merits, this factor weighs  
12 against dismissal. Id.

13 After weighing the factors, the Court finds that dismissal without prejudice is  
14 appropriate. Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that:

- 15 1. This case be dismissed, without prejudice, because of Plaintiff's failure to  
16 prosecute this case; and
- 17 2. The Clerk of Court be directed to close this case.

18 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States district  
19 judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within  
20 fourteen (14) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may  
21 file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to  
22 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations."

23 \\\

24 \\\

25 \\\

26 \\\

27 \\\

28 \\\

1 Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in  
2 the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)  
3 (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).  
4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: April 26, 2023

/s/ Eric P. Grogan  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28